



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,983	03/07/2001	Bob Ebert	PALM-3524.US.P	5877

7590 11/10/2005
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/801,983		EBERT ET AL	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Ting Zhou		2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 2 September 2005 under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/801,983 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
2. The amendments filed on 2 September 2005, submitted with the filing of the RCE have been received and entered. Claims 1-27 as amended are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2173

3. Claims 11-13 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vong et al. U.S. Patent 6,209,011 (hereinafter "Vong").

Referring to claim 11, Vong teaches a method of notification that alerts users of an event (column 1, lines 63-66, column 3, lines 62-67 and Figure 3). Specifically, this method is capable of receiving a first attention request from a first application that is associated with a first record entry when the first record entry requires attention from a user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager receives this attention request from the alarm manager) (column 7, lines 32-44), automatically storing the first attention request in a memory when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the request is sent to the notification manager which is loaded in the memory of the computer system) (column 5, lines 8-19), determining a plurality of outstanding attention requests wherein each are associated with a corresponding record entry and a corresponding application, each of the outstanding attention requests still requiring attention from the user, the plurality of outstanding attention requests including the first attention request (ability to determine and handle a plurality of attention requests from multiple applications requiring attention from the user; this can also include the first attention request, which can be snoozed, and therefore, still requiring attention from the user) (column 8, lines 20-24 and 31-33), automatically sending a first request for information to the first application, the information being associated with the first record entry and is dependent on the number of outstanding attention requests being managed (a plurality of alarms can be set

Art Unit: 2173

for 8:00AM and therefore, when the hardware clock determines that it is 8:00AM, the alarm manager can send a plurality of notifications to the notification manager) (column 7, lines 24-31 and column 8, lines 31-39), creating a first notification dialog for displaying the information, wherein the first application generates and fills in the information in the notification dialog when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager checks to see how the user wants to be notified of the alarm and notifies the user accordingly; for example, if the user wishes to be notified by a dialog display, the notification system can create a dialog box displaying alarm information, as shown in Figure 7), automatically displaying the first notification dialog on top of an on-screen display associated with a second application that is active (when the notification manager is notified by the alarm manager that it is 8:00AM and an 8:00 AM attention request is pending, the notification manager displays the alarm on top of the current display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or displaying a dialog box alarm containing the notification information while other applications are running) (column 5, lines 8-17, column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30); and receiving a request to clear a current attention request from the plurality of attention requests, the current attention request taken from the plurality of outstanding attention requests (clearing from the display, i.e. turning off, the current outstanding attention request, i.e. the displayed notification alarm, once the user acknowledges he is aware of the notification, via pressing the snooze button for example) (column 3, lines 65-67, column 7, lines 62-65 and column 8, lines 16-30).

Referring to claim 12, Vong teaches receiving a display request (notification request) to display a selected record entry associated with a selected attention request from the plurality of outstanding attention requests (request to display a notification alarm), automatically switching from the second application (user interface allowing users to schedule an event notification) to the third application associated with the selected record entry (notification mechanism responsible for displaying scheduled notifications), displaying the attention request (turning on the LED or displaying the dialog box) and providing user interface with the selected record entry through the second application, as recited in column 2, lines 24-26 and 52-58, and column 5, lines 8-18 and 37-42.

Referring to claim 13, Vong teaches automatically launching the third application (the notification application is automatically activated upon the occurrence of an event) and automatically sending the display request to the third application (after the user schedules an event, the calendar application automatically calls the notification application with the request), as recited in column 3, lines 60-65 and column 7, lines 14-30.

Referring to claim 16, Vong teaches receiving a request to suspend the plurality of outstanding attention requests, suspending each of the plurality of outstanding attention requests for a predetermined period of time (rescheduling the alarm for an additional five-minute period), reactivating the second application and displaying the plurality of outstanding attention requests after a predetermined period of time has elapsed in the second notification dialog (redisplaying the alarm after the five-minute snooze time has elapsed), as recited in column 8, lines 20-30 and further illustrated in Figure 7.

Referring to claim 17, Vong teaches invoking (displaying) an alarm simultaneously with the display of the dialog box and the alarm taken from a group consisting essentially of an audible alarm (audio device), a visual alarm (light), a vibrator (vibration device), a flashing LED and flashing the notification dialog, as recited in column 4, lines 4-15 and column 8, lines 16-30). This is further shown in the table given in column 6, lines 45-57.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10 and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vong et al. U.S. Patent 6,209,011 (hereinafter "Vong") and Chari et al. U.S. Patent 6,553,416 (hereinafter "Chari").

Referring to claims 1 and 18, Vong teaches a method and system in an electronic device comprising a processor, memory unit, display screen and a notification system that alerts users of an event (Vong: column 1, lines 63-66, column 3, lines 62-67 and Figure 3). Specifically, this method and system is capable of receiving a first attention request (call) from an alarm manager associated with a first application that is associated with a first record entry when the first record entry requires attention from a user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from

Art Unit: 2173

the user, the notification manager receives this attention request from the alarm manager) (Vong: column 7, lines 32-44), automatically storing the first attention request in a memory when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the request is sent to the notification manager which is loaded in the memory of the computer system) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-19), automatically sending a first request for information to the first application when the first record entry requires attention from the user, the information associated with the first record entry (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the interrupt manager sends this request to the first application, or the notification manager to be executed) (Vong: column 7, lines 32-44), creating a notification dialog for displaying the information, wherein the first application generates and fills in the information in the notification dialog when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager checks to see how the user wants to be notified of the alarm and notifies the user accordingly; for example, if the user wishes to be notified by a dialog display, the notification system can create a dialog box displaying alarm information, as shown in Figure 7), and automatically displaying the notification dialog on top of an on-screen display that is generated by a second application that is active (when the notification manager is notified by the alarm manager that it is 8:00AM and an 8:00 AM attention request is pending, the notification manager displays the alarm on top of the current display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or

Art Unit: 2173

displaying a dialog box alarm containing the notification information while other applications are running) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-17, column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30).

However, although Vong teaches the deactivation of requests when the user acknowledges the notification alert (Vong: column 3, lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 62-65), Vong fails to explicitly teach deleting from memory any outstanding attention requests that has been cleared and no longer needs user's attention. Chari teaches a method and system for managing alerts similar to that of Vong. In addition, Chari further teaches the deletion of notifications in column 12, lines 10-28. This can also be seen in Figure 4A (reference character "438"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having teachings of Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the notification system and method of Vong to include the ability to delete notifications, as taught by Chari. One would have been motivated to make such a combination to delete requests that are no longer active and in need of attention in order to conserve memory space, time and bandwidth, especially on a small-screen device such as a personal digital assistant or cellular phone.

Referring to claims 2 and 19, Vong, as modified, disclose determining a plurality of outstanding attention requests, each associated with a corresponding record entry and a corresponding application, each of outstanding attention requests still requiring attention from the user, the plurality of outstanding requests including the first attention request (ability to determine and handle a plurality of attention requests from multiple applications requiring attention from the user; this can also include the first attention request, which can be snoozed, and therefore, still requiring attention from the user) (Vong: column 8, lines 20-24 and 31-33).

Referring to claims 10 and 27, Vong, as modified, teach a method and system in which the electronic device is a palm sized computer system (portable handheld computing device) (Vong: column 1, lines 63-64).

Referring to claims 3 and 20, Vong, as modified, teach deletion from memory each of the plurality of outstanding attention requests that have been cleared and no longer need user's attention (Chari: column 12, lines 10-28 and Figure 4A).

Referring to claims 4-5 and 21-22, Vong fails to explicitly teach the ability to request and view information regarding the attention requests in a list format. As can be seen from Figure 6, Chari shows the display of a log window containing the list of alerts that are still active. Therefore, if there are active attention requests, they can be determined and displayed on a display screen via a notification dialog that contains a list of these alerts, as recited in column 7, lines 37-46. Having the teachings of Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the notification system and method of Vong to include the list format display of active notifications, as taught by Chari. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination to allow the users to view and keep track of all active notification alerts together in a log file.

Referring to claims 6-9 and 23-26, while Vong fails to explicitly teach the ability to request and view the attention request information in detailed format and the singular display of the details of the attention requests. As can be seen in Figure 5, Chari shows the display of one detailed notification dialog (alert screen) that contains all the details regarding the alert, i.e., the date, time, and description of the alert. Therefore, this shows detailed information regarding a notification can be gathered and singularly displayed on the screen as a detailed notification

Art Unit: 2173

dialog. It would then have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the detailed format of display for the alerts can be requested whether the plurality of attention requests contain every request except the first attention request, as is the case in claims 6, 7, 23 and 24, or only the first attention request, as is the case in claims 8, 9, 25 and 26. Having the teachings of Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the notification system and method of Vong to include the singular display of detailed notification dialogs, as taught by Chari. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination to allow users to view all the details related to an alert in a single window display.

5. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vong et al. U.S. Patent 6,209,011 (hereinafter "Vong"), as applied to claim 11 above, and Chari et al. U.S. Patent 6,553,416 (hereinafter "Chari").

Referring to claims 14 and 15, Vong discloses all of the limitations as applied to claim 11 above. Specifically, Vong teaches clearing (turning off) the outstanding attention requests (notification alarms) once the user acknowledges he is aware of the notifications (via pressing the snooze button for example), as recited in column 8, lines 16-30. However, Vong fails to explicitly teach clearing the selected outstanding attention request by deleting it from memory. Chari teaches a method for managing alerts similar to that of Vong. In addition, Chari further teaches, in column 12, lines 9-28, receiving a request from the user to clear an attention request (delete an alert) and deleting that alert from memory. Specifically, Chari describes the ability to delete a plurality of alerts (Chari: column 12, lines 13-20). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the notification system capable of clearing outstanding attention requests of Vong to include the ability to delete alerts, as taught by Chari. One would have been motivated to make such a combination to delete requests that are no longer active and in need of attention in order to conserve memory space, time and bandwidth, especially on a small-screen device such as a personal digital assistant or cellular phone.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2 September 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

7. With respect to amended claim 11, the examiner respectfully notes that the amended claim only recites receiving requests to clear a current outstanding attention request, and do not explicitly recite the deletion of those requests like claims 1 and 18 do. Vong teaches that a current outstanding request such as a displayed notification alarm can be cleared from the display via user input, i.e. request such as selection of the snooze button, as recited in column 8, lines 15-40.

8. With respect to amended claims 1 and 18, the applicant argues that the combination of Vong and Chari is improper and would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as neither reference explicitly recites the motivation to combine the references as suggested. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion

Art Unit: 2173

to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both Vong and Chari teach an interface for managing and displaying alerts to the user. Chari states that prior art systems for displaying alerts take up and waste valuable time and bandwidth, as recited in column 2, lines 39-63; therefore, Chari suggests the motivation of conserving bandwidth and thus improving system processing time. Furthermore, it is generally known to one skilled in the art, that deletion of items from memory frees up space in memory storage and therefore improves processing time. In view of the above, the examiner respectfully argues that both the references themselves and knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art provides motivation for improvements to prior art systems such as that obtained by the combination and therefore, the 103 rejection is proper.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ



CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER